

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Michael S. Undlin,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil No. 08-1855 (JNE/FLN)  
ORDER

City of Minneapolis, Police Chief  
Tim Dolan, Minneapolis Police Officer  
Lance Faust, John Doe I, Jane Doe I,  
Hennepin County, Richard Stanek,  
Brian Peterson, Vernon Trombley,  
Brock Heldt, Brie Pileggi, Deb Miller,  
Robert Hillestad, John Doe II, and  
Jane Doe II,

Defendants.

In an Order dated March 16, 2009, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint. Judgment was entered the next day. Plaintiff filed a request to make a motion to reconsider on March 30, 2009. In an Order dated April 10, 2009, the Court construed this request as a motion to alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, *see Broadway v. Norris*, 193 F.3d 987, 989 (8th Cir. 1999), and set a deadline of Friday, April 24, 2009, for Plaintiff to file a memorandum and exhibits in support of his Rule 59(e) motion. On April 16, 2009, Plaintiff filed a motion to stay the Order dismissing the Complaint, to extend the deadline for filing a notice of appeal, and to continue the deadlines for his Rule 59(e) motion. On April 20, 2009, the Court denied as moot the April 16 motion insofar as Plaintiff sought to stay the Order dismissing his Complaint and to extend the deadline for filing an appeal and denied the April 16 motion insofar as Plaintiff sought to continue the deadlines set for his Rule 59(e) motion. Plaintiff filed his memorandum in support of his Rule 59(e) motion on April 24, 2009.

On April 27, 2009, Plaintiff sent an e-mail to chambers indicating that his memorandum in support of his Rule 59(e) motion was incorrectly linked in the CM/ECF system to his motion to stay the Order dismissing the Complaint, to extend the deadline for filing a notice of appeal, and to continue the deadlines for the Rule 59(e) motion rather than to his Rule 59(e) motion.

The Court construes Plaintiff's April 27, 2009, e-mail as a motion to correct the docket.

Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is directed to docket Plaintiff's April 27, 2009, e-mail and to amend the docket on CM/ECF to indicate that Plaintiff's memorandum of law [Docket No. 91] is linked to his Rule 59(e) motion [Docket No. 87] instead of to his motion to stay the Order dismissing the Complaint, to extend the deadline for filing a notice of appeal, and to continue the deadlines for his Rule 59(e) motion [Docket No. 89]. Therefore, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Clerk of Court shall docket the Plaintiff's April 27, 2009 e-mail.
2. The Clerk of Court shall amend the docket on CM/ECF to indicate that Plaintiff's memorandum of law [Docket No. 91] is linked to his Rule 59(e) motion [Docket No. 87] instead of to his motion to stay the Order dismissing the Complaint, to extend the deadline for filing a notice of appeal, and to continue the deadlines for the Rule 59(e) motion [Docket No. 89].

Dated: April 29, 2009

s/ Joan N. Ericksen  
JOAN N. ERICKSEN  
United States District Judge